



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,153	12/08/2000	Richard Golden	20990023-1	2118

7590 10/17/2003
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SHRADER, LAWRENCE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,153

Applicant(s)

GOLDEN, RICHARD

Examiner

Lawrence Shrader

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/2/01;3/26/01;12/08/00.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 11; 12 – 17; and 18 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meltzer et al., 6,125,391 (hereinafter referred to as Meltzer).

Meltzer discloses an XML to Java converter mapping software components to XML tags:

In regard to claim 1:

“parsing the input stream,” See column 3, lines 19 – 44 and column 5, lines 5 – 12; e.g., Figures 3 and 7.

“as a tag is parsed, invoking the software component mapped to it.” Meltzer discloses an XML document with tags mapped to object modules that are invoked when the tags are parsed (column 25, lines 44 – 57; column 26, lines 59 – 62; e.g., Figure 4, ref 403).

In regard to claim 2, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...the extensible markup language is XML.” Meltzer explicitly discloses an XML/JAVA conversion tool (column 25, lines 44 – 57; e.g., Figure 4, ref 403) wherein the extensible markup language is XML.

In regard to claim 3, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...the discrete software components are classes in an object-oriented programming language or procedures or functions in a procedural programming language.” See column 25, lines 44 – 57; column 26, lines 59 – 62.

In regard to claim 4, incorporating the rejection of claim 3:

“...the input stream comprises at least one tag which is formed by a start tag and an end tag, ...at least one of a method which is invoked as the start tag is parsed...” Meltzer discloses an XML document that is parsed having start tags and end tags (column 27, lines 4 – 8) that identify the elements mapped to application objects (column 5, lines 5 – 12).

In regard to claim 5, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...when the input stream is parsed, a hierarchical memory structure, which corresponds to the input stream, is also built in a memory of the computer system.” Meltzer discloses that a hierarchical (tree) structure is built using the DOM parser (column 28, lines 8 – 13).

In regard to claim 7, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...an extensible markup language output stream is generated, and the output is used as an input stream for another execution method.” See Figures 3 and 7.

In regard to claim 8, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...the computer system is a server in a network, and the input stream processed by the server is comprised in a request received from a client over the network or is comprised in an output from a database.” See column 7, line 55 to column 8, line 6),

In regard to claim 9, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...the invoked software components comprise at least one software component for accessing a database.” See column 24, lines 48 – 53; Figures 3 and 7.

In regard to claim 10, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“...the invoked software components comprise at least one of a software component for sending electronic mail and a software component for sending facsimiles.” See column 15, lines 1 – 15).

In regard to claim 11, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

“the computer system comprises a local computer and a remote computer which communicate with each other, and at least some of the commands...are executed on the remote computer, but the results of the execution are output on the local computer,,, wherein the communication between the local and the remote computers comprises an extensible markup language stream...” See column 1, lines 38 – 42; column 9, lines 9 – 27; e.g., Figures 1, 3, and 7.

In regard to claim 12 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 1):

Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claim 13 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 7), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 7.

In regard to claim 14 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 8), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 8.

In regard to claim 15 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 9), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 9.

In regard to claim 16 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 10), incorporating the rejection of claim 12: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 10.

In regard to claim 17 (a computer system corresponding to the method of claim 11), incorporating the rejection of claim 14: Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 11.

In regard to claim 18 (a computer program product including program code corresponding to the method of claim 1): Rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claim 19 (a computer program product including program code corresponding to the method of claim 11), incorporating the rejection of claim 18:

"... wherein the program code is stored on a computer-readable medium data carrier or is in the form of signals transmitted over a computer network." Meltzer discloses transmittal of program code as signals transmitted over a network (column 9, lines 9 – 27)

In regard to claim 20 (a computer program product including program code corresponding to the method of claim 1), incorporating the rejection of claim 18:

"a class which parses the input stream,"

"a class which implements a parses interface,"

"a class which creates a document,"

"a class which creates a taglet, i.e. which binds objects to tag names,"

"a class which provides behavior for the taglets."

Meltzer discloses code that parses the input stream and implements the parser interface (e.g., Figure 3, ref 300 and 301), generates a document (e.g., Figure3, ref 302), a class that binds objects to tag names and provides behavior for the taglets (column 3, lines 19 – 44; column 5, lines 5 – 12; column 25, lines 44 – 57; column 26, lines 59 – 62)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer et al., U.S. Patent 6,125,391 in view of Walker et al., 6,434,529 (hereinafter referred to as Walker).

In regard to claim 6, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...the mapping between the tags and the discrete software objects is changed before, during or after the parsing process." Meltzer discloses mapping tags to software objects, but does not disclose changing the parsing process. However, Walker discloses mapping changes between tags and objects (column 12, lines 39 – 44) to change color on a newly registered object.

Art Unit: 2124

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Meltzer invention with the ability to change the mapping process as taught by Walker, because the ability to modify the mapping gives flexibility to the mapping process in cases where different objects may be selected by a user requiring, for example, different coloring in selected objects, as taught by Walker (column 12, lines 45 – 54)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,205,407 to Testa et al., regarding parsing test routines and outputting to a translator.

U.S. Patent 6,569,207 to Sundaresan, regarding generation of classes from XML schemas and automatically instantiating objects from those class specifications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Shrader whose telephone number is (703) 305-8046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:00-16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2124

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

October 8, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Chavis".

JOHN CHAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2124